

WAG 3, OU 3-13 INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL FIELD INSPECTION CHECKLIST

DATE(S)/TIME(S): 4-10-01 / a.m.

INSPECTOR: MARGIE ENGLISH WAG-3 MANAGER IDEQ
Name Title Organization

INSPECTOR: KATHY IVY WAG-3 MANAGER USEPA
Name Title Organization

1. Group Number or NFA Designation: 5
2. Identify security restrictions that would limit or control public trespass:
YES Restricted Security Access to the INEEL
YES Restricted Security Access to INTEC fenced boundary
3. Release Site ID and Description: CPP-23 CPP Injection Well (MAH-FE-PL-304)
4. Release sites with land use other than Industrial: NONE
5. Provide the current status of any remedial actions at the release sites, e.g., remedial design, construction, O&M, etc:
Remedial Action -- investigatory
6. Visual inspection matrix. If actions have been taken that would modify or close a monitoring well or respond to a deficiency identified in a previous inspection, take photographs and fill out "The Site Inspection Photo Number Log" for the annual report.

Well ID	Well ID Label Intact and Readable?	Locked?	Abutment Condition	Concrete Pad Condition	Surveyed Location Map Available?	Evidence of Human Intrusion (i.e., unauthorized drilling, unlocked or missing well lock)
MW-18						
USGS-34						
USGS-35						
USGS-36						
USGS-37						
USGS-38						
USGS-39						
USGS-40						
USGS-41						
USGS-42						

Well ID	Well ID Label Intact and Readable?	Locked?	Abutment Condition	Concrete Pad Condition	Surveyed Location Map Available?	Evidence of Human Intrusion (i.e., unauthorized drilling, unlocked or missing well lock)
USGS-43						
USGS-44						
USGS-45	Yes	Yes	good	Yes		
USGS-46						
USGS-47						
USGS-48	Yes	Yes	good	PAD cracked	Yes	NONE
USGS-49						
USGS-51	Yes	Yes	NONE	good	Yes	NONE - 4 in fence for pad
USGS-52	couldn't see	Yes	Yes	Yes		NONE
USGS-57						
USGS-59	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes none	NONE
USGS-67						
USGS-77						
USGS-82						
USGS-84						
USGS-85						
USGS-111						
USGS-112						
USGS-113						
USGS-114						
USGS-115						
USGS-116						
USGS-121	Yes	Yes	good	good	Yes	NONE
USGS-122	Yes	Yes	good	good	Yes	NONE
USGS-123						
LF2-08						
LF2-09						
LF2-10						
LF2-11						
LF2-12						
LF3-08						
LF3-09						
LF3-10						
LF3-11						

7. Are any non-CERCLA wells operating in the groundwater IC restriction area?

YES *

NO

NA

If YES, describe the wells and what program(s) they operate under.

SWPP-3

* NOT ALL NON-CERCLA WELLS WERE INSPECTED BY

EPA / IDEQ. SEE NOTE (1) IN "IMPROVEMENTS" QUESTION 7
"IMPROVEMENTS" SECTION OF GROUP 4 CHECKLIST.

8. Does a DOE-ID Directive exist that restricts drilling into contaminated zones at OU 3-13 or the INEEL?

YES

NO *

If NO Explain: SEE QUESTION 8 OF GROUP 4 QUESTION 8.

9. Have required notices been sent to affected stakeholders (if applicable)?

YES

NO

NA

If NO Explain: _____

DEFICIENCIES:

10. Provide a description of any deficiencies and what efforts or measures have been or will be taken to correct problems: _____

IMPROVEMENTS:

11. Describe any additional IC requirements that may be necessary due to unique circumstances observed during the visual inspection:

SEE NOTE (1) ON GROUP 4 CHECKLIST.

I certify that the above inspection report is true and accurate to the best of my ability.

[Signature]

Inspector signature

04/11/01

Date

Margie English

Inspector signature

4/11/01

Date

Rachel A. Collins, DOE-112 4/11/01

WAG 3, OU 3-13 INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL FIELD INSPECTION CHECKLIST

DATE(S)/TIME(S): 4-10-01 / a.m.

INSPECTOR: MARGIE ENGLISH WAG-3 MANAGER IDEQ
Name Title Organization

INSPECTOR: KATHY IVY WAG-3 MANAGER USEPA
Name Title Organization

1. Group Number or NFA Designation: 6
2. Identify security restrictions that would limit or control public trespass:
Restricted Security Access to the INEEL
N/A Restricted Security Access to INTEC fenced boundary
for this site
3. Release sites with land use other than Industrial: NONE
4. Release Site IDs, descriptions, and visual inspection matrix. On the table below please indicate "YES" or "NO" for observations based upon the visual inspection. If actions have been taken associated with remediation, site changes, or changes in land-use, take photographs and fill out the "Site Inspection Photo Number Log" for the annual report. Sign location specifications are provided in the ICP. Deficiencies should be addressed in No. 7.

Release Site	Description	Status of Remedial Action	Evidence of Human Intrusion	Observed Boundary Monuments	Observed Warning Signs/Barriers
CPP-84	Buried Gas Cylinders	Pre-Design	YES ^{NO} _{NME}	NO - See item # 7	YES ^{Signs +} _{roped barrier}
CPP-94	Buried Gas Cylinders	Pre-Design	Yes *	Yes	Yes

* EXCAVATION REMAINS OPEN PENDING SOIL SAMPLING

5. Institutional Controls records review. On the table below, please indicate "YES", "NO", or "NA" for records reviewed during the inspection. Answers of "NA" indicate that the records, such as work permits or personnel training records, were not applicable at the time of the inspection (i.e., release site not accessed for work purposes).

See item 7(B)

Release Site	CFLUP Review		Observed Work Permit(s)/RWP's	Observed Personnel Training Records	Observed NOD(s)	Observed Notices to Affected Stakeholders
	Observed Surveyed Maps	Listing of Required ICs				
CPP-84			See 7(A)			
CPP-94						

6. Listing of Work Permits and NODs.⁴ Deficiencies should be addressed in No. 7.

See item 8 (A)

<i>Standard 101 Work Permits</i>	<i>Notices of Disturbance</i>

DEFICIENCIES:

7. Provide a description of any deficiencies and what efforts or measures have been or will be taken to correct problems: _____

A) - Site CPP-84: Could not locate survey markers. Need to establish these

B) - Since the CFMP is currently being updated, we could not check those items pertaining to this record review (i.e., observed survey maps, listing of required IC's, and observed notice to stakeholders).

IMPROVEMENTS:

8. Describe any additional IC requirements that may be necessary due to unique circumstances observed during the visual inspection: _____

A) We are not observing Personnel TRAINING Records as part of the IC inspection for Group 6 this year.

⁴ Agency inspectors may assess a random sampling of this information to determine if there are any deficiencies.

I certify that the above inspection report is true and accurate to the best of my ability.

Margie English 4-11-01
Inspector signature Date

Kath M L 04/11/01
Inspector signature Date

Rachel L. Collins, DOE-10 4/11/01

WAG 3, OU 3-13 INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL FIELD INSPECTION CHECKLIST

DATE(S)/TIME(S): 4-10-01 p.m.

INSPECTOR: KATHY 104 WAG-3 MANAGER USEPA
Name Title Organization

INSPECTOR: MARGIE ENGLISH WAG-3 MANAGER IDEQ
Name Title Organization

1. Group Number or NFA Designation: 7
2. Identify security restrictions that would limit or control public trespass:
yes Restricted Security Access to the INEEL
yes Restricted Security Access to INTEC fenced boundary
3. Release sites with land use other than Industrial: NONE
4. Release Site IDs, descriptions, and visual inspection matrix. On the table below please indicate "YES" or "NO" for observations based upon the visual inspection. If actions have been taken associated with remediation, site changes, or changes in land-use, take photographs and fill out the "Site Inspection Photo Number Log" for the annual report. Sign location specifications are provided in the ICP. Deficiencies should be addressed in No. 7.

Release Site	Description	Status of Remedial Action	Evidence of Human Intrusion	Observed Boundary Monuments	Observed Warning Signs/Barriers
CPP-69	Abandoned LRWST CPP VES-SFE-20	Pre-Design	NONE	NO - *	sign on Bldg 642

* No observed monuments - were told that corners of Bldg 642 have been surveyed

5. Institutional Controls records review. On the table below, please indicate "YES", "NO", or "NA" for records reviewed during the inspection. Answers of "NA" indicate that the records, such as work permits or personnel training records, were not applicable at the time of the inspection (i.e., release site not accessed for work purposes).

See item # 7(A)

Release Site	CFLUP Review		Observed Work Permit(s)/RWPs	Observed Personnel Training Records	Observed NOD(s)	Observed Notices to Affected Stakeholders
	Observed Surveyed Maps	Listing of Required ICs				
CPP-69				*		

* see item # 8(A)

6. Listing of Work Permits and NODs.* Deficiencies should be addressed in No. 7.

<i>Standard 101 Work Permits</i>	<i>Notices of Disturbance</i>
See item # 8(A)	

DEFICIENCIES:

7. Provide a description of any deficiencies and what efforts or measures have been or will be taken to correct problems: _____

A.) Since the CFLUP is currently being updated, we could not inspect those items pertaining to this record review (i.e., observed Survey maps, listing of required IC's, observed Notice to stakeholders

IMPROVEMENTS:

8. Describe any additional IC requirements that may be necessary due to unique circumstances observed during the visual inspection: _____

A. we are not observing Personnel Training Records as part of IC inspections for Group 7 this year.

* Agency inspectors may assess a random sampling of this information to determine if there are any deficiencies.

I certify that the above inspection report is true and accurate to the best of my ability.

Margie English

Inspector Signature

4-11-01

Date

Kathy M. S.

Inspector signature

04/11/01

Date

Rachel L. Collins^{MD}, DOE-ID 4/11/01

WAG 3, OU 3-13 INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL FIELD INSPECTION CHECKLIST

DATE(S)/TIME(S): 4-10-01 / a.m. and p.m.

INSPECTOR: Margie English WAG-3 Manager IDEG
Name Title Organization

INSPECTOR: Kathy Ivy WAG-3 Manager USEPA
Name Title Organization

1. Group Number or NFA Designation: NFA
2. Identify security restrictions that would limit or control public trespass:
Yes Restricted Security Access to the INEEL
Yes Restricted Security Access to INTEC fenced boundary
3. Release sites with land use other than Industrial: NONE
4. Release Site IDs, descriptions, and visual inspection matrix. On the table below please indicate "YES" or "NO" for observations based upon the visual inspection. If actions have been taken associated with remediation, site changes, or changes in land-use, take photographs and fill out the "Site Inspection Photo Number Log" for the annual report. Sign location specifications are provided in the ICP. Deficiencies should be addressed in No. 87

Release Site	Description	Status of Remedial Action	Evidence of Human Intrusion	Observed Boundary Monuments
CPP-06	Trench east of CPP-603 Fuel Storage Basin	5-Year Remedy Review	NONE	see item 7(A)
CPP-17	Soil storage area south of CPP Peach Bottom Fuel Storage Area	5-Year Remedy Review	NONE	Yes
CPP-22	Particulate air release south of CPP-603	5-Year Remedy Review	NONE	Yes
CPP-88	Radiologically contaminated soil	5-Year Remedy Review		
CPP-90	CPP-708 ruthenium detection	5-Year Remedy Review	NONE	Yes
CPP-95	Airborne plume	5-Year Remedy Review	*	*

CPP-26

NONE Yes

* Did not inspect entire site or look for boundary markers for this large site.

- See item 7(B)

CPD-26

- [illegible]

A-31

DEFICIENCIES:

7. Provide a description of any deficiencies and what efforts or measures have been or will be taken to correct problems: _____

(A) CPP-06 -- Survey monuments pending installation

(B) Since the CFLUP is currently being updated, we could not inspect those items pertaining to this record review (i.e., observed survey maps, listing of required IC's, observed NOTICE TO Stakeholders).

IMPROVEMENTS:

8. Describe any additional IC requirements that may be necessary due to unique circumstances observed during the visual inspection: _____

A) We did not observe Personnel Training records as part of IC inspections for the NFA sites this year.

I certify that the above inspection report is true and accurate to the best of my ability.

Margie English 4-11-01
Inspector signature Date

[Signature] 04/11/01
Inspector signature Date

Rachel L. Collins, DC-10 4/11/01

IC Monitoring Report Agency Inspections Kick Off Meeting

Date: April 9, 2001

Attendees:

Margie English-IDEQ
Kathy Ivy-EPA
Rachel Collins-DOE-ID
Howard Forsythe-BBWI
Bob James-BBWI
Lee Tuott-BBWI
Bob Sanders-SERG, Inc.

Meeting Minutes:

1. IDEQ and EPA will look at NOD's and Work Orders to determine if training requirements were met during work associated with the NOD's. Bob Sanders to bring the list of effected NOD's tomorrow for the inspections.
2. A schedule for next year's inspection was tentatively agreed upon. Discussions will begin on the revision to the IC Plan in March 2002. Agency IC Monitoring Report Inspections will be held in June 2002.
3. Checklists will be revised as needed to streamline the inspection process. Especially in areas such as CFLUP review.
4. A discussion was held concerning the DOE-ID Directive concerning restricting groundwater use on the Group 4 and Group 5 sites and wells. The current IC plan proposed that an existing DOE Directive concerning the use of the required NEPA process which includes an Environmental Checklist and IDEQ approvals for drinking water systems as being sufficient to control the activities without developing a new directive. The Agencies questioned this approach and were going to check and see what they felt should be accomplished to satisfy this requirement. DOE-ID will provide additional information on the NEPA process for Agency review.
5. It was decided that the group would meet at 7:30 AM in the TSA / TSB Lobby to go to the INEEL Site to begin the inspections.
6. It was decided that a listing of the survey coordinates of the Group 4 and Group 5 wells would be included as an Appendix to the Monitoring Report.
7. Erick Neher of BBWI was to get IDEQ and EPA a copy of the monitoring well checklist that IDEQ helped BBWI develop as a result of the review of the Group 5 Monitoring Plan Document.
8. Photos will be taken of sites with changes. The Agencies will identify these sites during the walkthroughs.
9. It does not appear that the general INEEL restrictions (e.g. security access) are included as part of the CFLUP. These restrictions should be added to the CFLUP, or the IC Plan should be modified to reflect where the discussions concerning the general restrictions to the INEEL are located.

IC MONITORING REPORT AGENCY INSPECTIONS CLOSE-OUT MEETING

DATE: 4-10-2001 & 4-11-2001

ATTENDEES:

4-10-2001:

Rachel Collins-DOE-ID
Kathy Ivy-EPA
Margie English-IDEQ
Michael Arndt-BBWI
Lee Tuott-BBWI
Brandon Smith-BBWI
Bob Sanders-SERG, Inc.

4-11-2001:

Rachel Collins-DOE-ID
Kathy Ivy-EPA
Margie English-IDEQ
Lee Tuott-BBWI
Bob Sanders-SERG, Inc.

INSPECTION NOTES & MEETING MINUTES:

The agencies (EPA and IDEQ) held their annual inspection of the ICs for the WAG 3 IC Monitoring Report on 4-10-2001 and 4-11-2001. These are the notes from the inspections and the meeting minutes of the close out meeting. The agencies finalized the annual inspection checklists. These minutes are intended to supplement the agency checklists and identify topics for 2002 IC Plan revision.

- 1) Site 84 had no survey marker boundary pins installed yet.
- 2) Site 06 had no survey boundary marker pins installed yet.
- 3) The map for Site 26 is not on the map for the NFA sites. Site 26 is shown on the Group 1 map.
- 4) Survey boundary marker pins were not on some of the corners of the Group 3 Sites located near the Old Calciner Cap. These Group 3 sites had been surveyed, but due to the site corners/pins being located on the WCF cement cap or on a cement walkway/driveway, the pins were not placed in the cement to avoid an intrusion into the WCF cap or the walkway/driveways. If the CERCLA site occurred at a building corners or primary fence post, these "markers" were used in lieu of separate survey corners.
- 5) The following items will be discussed in the monitoring report:
 - The CFLUP is still in development. A few of the WAG 3 sites were reviewed and found to have the required information. However, the CFLUP will not be available to the public for several months and was not inspected for this IC Monitoring Report.

- A discussion about survey boundary marker pins verses survey points associated with permanent structures such as buildings or fences should be included in the IC Monitoring Report and the IC Plan.
 - The IC inspection checklist should be modified to reflect that a sampling of NODs/training records will be spot-checked during the IC inspections.
 - Section 4.7.3 in the 2001 IC Plan should be modified to reflect the statement that training records will only be spot-checked.
- 6) It was decided that next year that a sampling of NODs, such as the Group 1 Tank Farm sites, would be used for the spot-checks of training records.
 - 7) An explanation of the approval process for work Orders will be given in the IC Plan and the IC Monitoring Report. The steps discussed established that next year, DOE-ID would provide the Agencies with a list of the NODs that had been completed within the year at least 2 weeks prior to the 2002 inspection. The Agencies will select several NODs (not to exceed 5) from the list, and notify DOE-ID of their choice at least 1 week prior to the inspection. DOE-ID will have the NODs, Work Permits, and Computerized training records ready for the Agencies to review during their inspection. The timeframes are suggested schedules and may be adjusted during the IC Plan revision.
 - 8) A well inspection checklist was handed out (this checklist came out of the Group 4 well Monitoring Plan). It was decided that if possible this checklist would be used by the appropriate BBWI personnel during their well sampling and inspections. DOE-ID would discuss whether it is possible to have other samplers such as USGS complete this checklists also. These completed inspection checklists will then be reviewed by the agencies during next year's inspection. A discussion of this checklist will also be provided in the IC Plan and the IC Monitoring Report.
 - 9) The WAG 3 CEC&C for Group 2 sites will be reviewed and the stage of the D&D process for the sites within Group 2 will be provided for next year's inspections and IC Monitoring Report.
 - 10) The IC Monitoring Report will be a concise document that includes an introduction and brief discussion of what took place during the inspections. All inspection checklist documentation and the meeting minutes will be provided in appendices to the document.
 - 11) A more detailed discussion about Stakeholder Notifications should be given in the IC Plan and the IC Monitoring Report. It was unclear to the Agencies when DOE-ID would propose to notify Stakeholders as part of the IC for a particular Site or Group. Need to look at the discussion providing typical examples of when stakeholders would be notified.
 - 12) Site 58 may be expanded due to contamination being discovered as part of the trenching for the Group 1 Tank Farm drainage project. BBWI is investigating the source of contamination, levels of contamination and constituents, and extent of contamination to determine if it is part of Site 58 or a new site. The agencies identified Figure 5-1 of the IC Plan for guidance.